

A
Second Letter
TO
Father LEWIS SABRAN, Jesuite,
IN
ANSWER
TO HIS
REPLY.

By Edw Geo A.M.

December the
2d. 1687.

*Imprimatur, hic Libellus cui Titulus
(A Second Letter to F. L. S.)
Jo. Battely.*

LONDON,
Printed for Henry Mortlock at the Phoenix in
St. Paul's Church-yard. 1688.

A
Second Letter
TO
THE
REV. SAMUEL JOHNSON
IN
ANSWER
TO HIS

Letter to the Author of the
First Letter to H. A. J.
J. B. B. B.

LONDON,
Printed for Henry Baskin at the Phoenix,
St. Paul's Church-yard, 1793.

*A Second Letter to Father Lewis Sabran
Jesuite, in Answer to his Reply.*

Novemb. 30th. 1687.

Reverend Sir,

I Was very glad to hear yesterday of your intentions of giving me an answer to the Letter I wrote to you five days ago; I did expect I should find something extraordinary, and some reasons or arguments of strength sufficient to convince the world, that even the *demonstrative argument* from *Isidore* ought to be set aside, since you could produce evidences as strong and as positive on the other hand; and therefore as soon as I heard it, I resolved with my self not to be obstinate in the defence of my *charge* against you, but fairly and honestly to own my mistake, if you did bring on your side any thing stronger and more rational than what had been produced against you.

But when I this day had your *Answer* from the Press; the first perusal of it sufficiently informed me, that you had not done that thing, which indeed my private reason (I must confess) did assure me that you could not, I mean that you had not given any thing of moment in defence of your self.

One thing I must own I was surpris'd at, the great alteration in your style betwixt your *two Letters*. This is as blustering and abusive, as the other was calm; you reflected in your Letter to the Honourable Lord on the *insulting and scurrilous language* of the *Hereticks*, but for your self you said, *far be it from me even to return a the like, we have no such custome, neither hath the Church of God: Truth* (say you) *would blush to be defended by such unwarrantable arms*: but it seems your mind is altered since, and now Truth will not blush to be so defended, and you can make use of *harsher words* (which others call insolent language) in the defence of Truth: but I must do you this justice to own, that you have not quitted the resolutions of the former Letter, since what you set your self so angryly to defend here is *no Truth* but a *gross Error*, as I shall very quickly shew.

^a Letter to a Peer, pag. 9.

^b Reply, p. 2.

You begin your Letter in a victorious stile, and reason good, since you say you have *the Opinion of all men of sense* that your Letter to the Peer of the Church of England hath cleared you sufficiently of the mistake I charged you with. I must confess I dare not deny what you say here, since I have not spoken with the hundredth part of the *men of sense* in the Town to know whether it be Truth that you write here: however thus far I dare speak, that I do not believe it, since I am afraid that by the ALL MEN of SENSE here is meant no more than SOME of your own party.

It was not from an *inconsiderate itch of Scribbling* (as you word
 * Reply, p. 2. it c) that I reflected upon *that passage* in your introduction to your Sermon at Chester. I was provoked to it from that passage's being so much cryed up, boasted of, and insisted upon as if it had been a most genuine and a most considerable Testimony (about *Praying to the Virgin Mary*) from St. Augustine: and therefore since I was quickly satisfied that the Sermon, out of which it was taken, was not St. Augustine's, I looked upon it as a duty I owed to the world, and particularly to the Nobility of the Church of England (some of whom had been urged much with that passage) to publish it to the whole Nation [in that page that was empty at the end of my Book] that *that Sermon de Sanctis* out of which it is taken, was not, nor could be St. Augustine's.

The Reasons I used there have been the subject of this Letter-Controversie betwixt us, and though you be resolved never to take any [farther] notice of such unknown persons, who conceal their names, yet I am resolved to defend my first Letter to you, and I believe I shall convince the world in it, that you ought to make some other Reply than you hitherto have, to the *Demonstrative Argument* from Isidore.

The first and least considerable Reason that I urged against the Sermon was from the Title and Subject of it. About this we have had the most ado, though I hinted in my Letter to you that the stress of the Controversie did not at all depend upon it. But you are resolved to insist upon this, and in your Reply you have marshal'd my reasonings for that proof first into a new Error, next into a false Inference, then into a plain cheat and contradiction.

These are very hard words, and therefore I come now to examine how I deserve them: 'Tis an Error (say you) that there

was

was not in St. ^a Augustine's time a general pious Belief of the Blessed ^a Reply, p. 3.
Virgin's Assumption: You refer me for the proof of what you say
 there to your Letter to the Peer: well, I have looked into it,
 and am no more convinced by it yet, than I was by my first ^a Letter to a
 perusal of it. The Authours named in that Paragraph ^c you Peer, p. 7.
 refer to are [the Supposititious Sermon of]

St. Hierome, St. Ihephonsus ^f, William Bishop of
 Paris, St. Bernard and others: but these can-
 not be the men to shew the General pious
 Belief of the Assumption in St. Austin's time, since
 you say you find in them, that they doubted of;
 or disbelieved ^g her [the B. Virgin] being as-
 sumed in Body into Heaven: and methinks these

Fathers and others look like a fair argument to prove against
 your GENERAL pious belief in St. Austin's time. To pass them
 therefore, who are either not to the purpose here, or against
 your assertion; there are but two Authours more in the Paragraph,
 St. Mellion's Sermon [which in your Reply hath changed both its
 name, and is called St. Melitons ^h Book] and Nicephorus: And ^b Reply, p. 3.
 now I would fain know of you, Sir, how either of these
 Authours prove what you assert a General pious Belief of
 the Assumption in St. Austin's time: as for Nicephorus, he lived not
 till almost a Thousand years after St. Austin, so that he is a most
 unfit Witness for such a purpose: but here you will tell me
 that Nicephorus is urged by you onely, to shew, that Juvenal Pa-
 triarch of Hierusalem proved the Truth of this Mystery to have been re-
 ceived of very Ancient Tradition before Marcian the Emperour. To
 this I answer, that Juvenal lived after St. Austin's time and there-
 fore can be no Witness as to his time: but passing this, the
 Credit of all this story depends upon Nicephorus Callistus, who
 is of no Authority herein, not onely because he lived not till
 the fourteenth Century, but because he is a most fabulous Writer.
 I have not time to insist on or urge what Monsieur Launoy hath
 offered against this Story, especially what he says ⁱ about the

silence of the Historians who lived in, near, or since that time down
 to Nicephorus, who is the first and onely Authour (according to
 him) that broached that fable about Juvenal and Marcian the
 Emperour. I have one argument to urge against your Juvenal,
 and that is, that it is impossible he could shew any such an-
 cient Tradition for the Assumption, since it is granted that the

^f I can meet with no Authour
 of this name either in your or
 our Criticks. I suppose you mean
 St. Ihephonsus; if you did, you
 should surely have corrected in
 your Reply the error in your
 Letter. ^g Letter to a Peer p. 7.

ⁱ Launoi de
 Controversia
 super exscri-
 bendo Paris.
 Ecclesia Mar-
 tyrologio ex-
 orta Judici-
 um. Paris.
 1671. p. 92

Writers of the Church before him never mentioned any such thing, and which is more since, this very Doctrine about Assumption was condemned in the same Century in a Council at Rome by Gelasius Pope with 70 other Bishops.

What I urge here concerns your Authour St. Melito, the supposititious book under whose name was condemned as Apocryphal. But pray, Sir, how do you prove to us that this Book under St. Melito's name was before St. Austine's time? the first news we hear of it is not till above 60 years after St. Austine's time, and the same time that we hear of the Book, we hear of its being condemned as an Apocryphal thing: Yet I will grant to you (what I do not believe) that the book was older; will any man of tolerable sense argue from this Book a General Pious Belief of the Assumption in St. Austine's time, when this very Book that taught it was condemned as Apocryphal at Rome in the same Century? ^k

^k Liber qui appellatur Transitus, id est, Assumptio Sanctæ Mariæ, apocryphus. Concil. Rom. I. sub Gelasio, An. Dom. 494. in Tom. 4. Concil. p. 1264. edit. Coffer.

I cannot but stay here to wonder a little at your saying there, that IF this Sermon be not S. Melito's Genuine work, it must be of some other Authour nigh those times. I can be no longer angry that you should stand up so obstinately for the 35th. Sermon de Sanctis, when I find you at most but dubious whether that Book (for so I would call it) under Melito's name be genuine or no; Whereas all the men of Learning in the Church have long since thrown it up as spurious and Apocryphal; I have already shown how it was condemned by a Pope in Council as Apocryphal twelve hundred years ago: Not long after that our Venerable Bede fell most severely upon it, and lays to the charge of the Authour of it Ignorance, and downright lying: so that De La Bigne was about striking it out of his Bibliotheca Patrum; but though he satisfied himself with some reasons for his continuing it there, yet this is his Conclusion about it; notwithstanding what hath been said above, it is ^l certain that this Book is falsely ascribed to S. Melito, that it is Apocryphal, and of no Authority, and to be altogether rejected for its mixtures, [of Truth and falsehood.] He then tells us that the Spanish Index Expurgatorius have ordered the whole of the Book from the 8th. Chapter to be expunged: and I can assure you that the History of the Assumption

^l Biblioth. Patrum T. 7. p. 580. Edit. Par. 1624.

Assumption is the subject of those Chapters which the *Index* hath ordered to be struck out: And yet you, Sir, after all this (and more which I could add) are not satisfied of that Book's being spurious: Which thing among *Learned Men* I am sure will not add any Lustre to one who writes himself of the *Society of Jesus*, but will satisfy the World, what sort of an *Adversary* I have to deal with.

Having shewn that your *Meliso* and your *Nicephorus* are of no Credit, and there being no other Authours offered for my Conviction, I pray Sir, where and how have you shewn the *General pious belief of the Virgin's Assumption in St. Austin's time*: And what ground had you for your charge of a *new Error* in me, when you are not able to evince the thing; all see at least that you did not do it there.

The next charge is a *false Inference*; my words upon which you ground it are these, *if the Day of Assumption do not ever signify the day of a Saints Death, why may not this be the exception?* Upon this you charge me with inferring that if *Assumption* do not always signify the Death of a Saint, therefore here it may signify the Corporal Assumption of the blessed Virgin, therefore it doth. I own that this last, [*therefore it doth*] is not onely a false but a silly inference, but I am sure it is not mine, I onely said, *why may not this be the Exception*. I appeal to my words just put down, and to all Scholars whether this be *ingenuous dealing*; so that your second charge is fallen.

But before you pass to your third great charge, you accuse me of a wilfull mistake in making you say that in the ancient Writings Feast or Day of Assumption when applyed to Saints did onely almost always signify the day of their Death. Well, Sir, and did not you say so your self in your first Letter; is not the almost of your own putting in there. These are the very words you used there; as if Feast or Day of Assumption in the Writings of Ancients, did **A L-MOST EVER** signify any thing else but the ^(m) Day of a ⁽ⁿ⁾ Letter to Saints Death. I must confess, Sir, that I thought I had to do with one who would admit of his own words, and not charge them upon his *Adversary*, as if they were his; with one that understood English: but I must now take my Lot, whatever it is.

Your next charge is of a Cheat in endeavouring to insinuate that the 35th Sermon did not speak of the *Virgin's Death*, but of her Assumption in the Vulgar sense of the word. But wherein

is

is the Cheat, I put down there the *very words* of the *Sermon* ; well but, say you, *Assumption* here does only signifie her *Death*, and you quote a passage of the *Sermon* for it, which is very accurately translated : I am not thoroughly satisfied of this, and my reason is this, because as I was, before I saw *your Letter*, satisfied that there was not a necessity of taking

You have twice translated in this short passage *Catholicæ Historiæ* the *Catholick Church*.

(ⁿ) *Vera autem de ejus Assumptione sententia hac esse probatur ut secundum Apostolum, sive in corpore, sive extra corpus Ignorantes, assumptionem super Angelos eam esse credamus. Sermo 35. de Sanctis.*

Assumption here in the *Vulgar sense*, so I was fully assured that the *Author* of the *Sermon* hath determined for *neither sense*, but hath left it *doubtfull* whether she were *assumed* *Corporally* or no (ⁿ).

You next take me to task about the mistake you made in quoting the 14th *Sermon de Sanctis* ; and you advise me to be less rash in my *Rhetorical Declamations*. But I cannot see my fault here : You did quote the 14th *Sermon de Sanctis*, I went thither, and when I could not find it there, I lookt into those *Sermons* I mentioned in my *Letter*, and not finding it in any of them, I concluded it to be *your mistake*, and did believe that some body had imposed upon you : I afterwards looked over all the *Sermons de Sanctis*, and not finding it any where, I thought you had been deceived, and I hope it was no fault to tell you so, as I then did. But you will have it that I was resolved to mistake you, that I might fancy something to object against. There are (say you) but two 14th *Sermons de Sanctis*, that of the first ancient Collection, and that in the other Compilation of Seventeen made by the *Divines of Paris*. I am not, Sir, to be frighted or born down with dint of Confidence. I say that it is false that there are two 14th *Sermons de Sanctis* ; the *Sermons de Sanctis* are a Body of one and fifty *Sermons*, and when any one talks of or quotes such or such a *Sermon de Sanctis*, we know readily whither to go. The *Sermons* added by the *Divines of Paris* are not intituled *de Sanctis* either in the *Louvain Edition* that I use, or in the *Benedictine* : And therefore when the *Benedictines* put one of the *Paris Sermons* down in their *Volume* they tell us in the *Margin* that it is the 5th or 7th, for example, *inter additos à Parisiensibus*, whereas when they put down one of the *Sermons de Sanctis*, they always tell us there that it is the 24th or 42d, for example *de Sanctis* : So that you cannot avoid seeing how you have run your self into a new mistake by resolving to defend an old one. I am afraid you are not so much versed in *St. Austin*,

stin, as your *Sermon* made shew of, and therefore I will give you this piece of advice, that when you meet with St. *Austin's Sermons de Sanctis* quoted in your *Authors*, you would not quickly swallow, but would examine a little, and be carefull, since of the 51 *Sermons de Sanctis* the *Benedictines* have rejected one and forty as *spurious*, and none of St. *Austins*.

We are now come to the next Argument from the *Manuscripts* against the *Sermon*. I charged you with having said nothing to the *Benedictine Manuscripts* which give us no *Author* of that *Sermon*, you tell us that my charge herein is ridiculous; and you endeavour to illustrate your answer, or rather to answer by a *Similitude* taken out of the *Law Courts*; but so ill applyed as nothing worse, for what is possession, in this case, must a *Book* always belong to such an *Author*, because once in his *Possession*; it seems the world have wronged *Arnobius* in vindicating *Oetavius* to its true *Master*; what say you, was it not in his *Possession*; did not the *Manuscripts* give it to *Arnobius*? or how came he to have it? what if some *Manuscripts* name no *Author* for it? This how ridiculous soever is all you would say here; and yet you pity my weakness and pass it by, because you love, not to insult on an erring *Adversaries* patent mistake: forgetting in the mean time that while you would make what I say ridiculous, you fall foul upon those *Benedictines* of *Paris* (whom I had it from) whose *Learning* is as much known as admired, and the world too much indebted to them for their excellent pains upon St. *Augustine*, whom they have published, and upon St. *Ambrose* whom they are now a fitting for the *Press*, to think their arguments ridiculous, because you think them so.

You next charge me with *Disingenuity* and *real forgery* in insinuating, That this *Sermon* bears not his (St. *Austine's*) name either in the *Manuscripts* used by the *Louvain Divines*, or by the *Benedictines*, when I own my self that the *Louvain Divines* only say it is not in several of their *Manuscripts*. Would any one but look into that *Paragraph* of my *Letter*, whence you quote this, he will easily see that the *Louvain Manuscripts* I speak of here are those that intituled this *Sermon* to *Fulbertus*. Those *Manuscripts* that gave it to *Fulbertus* are those I had in my eye there, when I said that the *Manuscripts* used by the *Louvain Divines*, give it to *Fulbertus* instead of St. *Austine*. I did not say all their *Manuscripts* gave it

against St. *Austine*, but that the *Manuscripts* spoken of at the beginning of the Paragraph did give it for *Fulbertus*.

You next ask me whether I do not egregiously destroy my own cause in appealing to most ancient *Manuscripts*, [my appeal was to the most as well as to the best *Manuscripts*] and the known style of the Author. I think, Sir, that I do not, and shall think so till you shew me not only that the style of this Sermon is purely St. *Austine's* but that it is attributed to him in the MOST, and BEST *Manuscripts*. These things you should regularly have done here, but instead of offering at one word of this nature for my Conviction: You think you answer me enough in asking me whether St. *Thomas* was not better acquainted with St. *Austine's* style, than I dare presume to be: and whether he had not as great a plenty, He and all his Contemporaries, and of fresher *Manuscripts*? [here must be added, for not onely the *Antisbesis*, but the *English* requires it, as I have.] But had you added this as the style requires it, every one would have seen the great weakness of it: I have not onely told you, but proved it to you in my first Letter, that *Thomas Aquinas* was no Critick: But as to your questions, you cannot be ignorant that I did not rely on my own judgment, or pretend to have MSS. by me. What I have said about these things hath the assistance not onely of the *Benedictine*, but *Lowvain* Divines, and the Questions you put to me do as much concern them as me, nay more: for they had those MSS. I insisted on, and therefore for the future pray lay your accusation right; and since the *Lowvain* Divines are in their Graves, write a sharp reproof to those impudent *Benedictines*, who have dared to understand St. *Augustin's* style as well or better than *Thomas Aquinas*, and have had the face to pretend to such MSS. as do oblige them to deprive St. *Austin* of that 35th Sermon de *Sanctis*.

After all this skirmishing hitherto, we are arrived at the Argument from S. *Isidore*. I urged that it was certain the 35th Sermon de *Sanctis* could not be St. *Austin's*, since *Isidore* was quoted in it, who lived not till two hundred years after St. *Austin*.

Your answer was, that the *Isidore* quoted in the Sermon could not be he that lived in the Seventh Century, and your proof was from a passage in the Sermon it self, in which the Author of the Sermon said that, In our time no Author among the Latins can be found

found [is found, saith the Sermon] who treating of the blessed Virgin's Death, hath been positive and express, or as I shall translate it, to have spoken any thing expressly concerning her Death; whereas no one (you add) could be ignorant of what so famous an Authour as S. Gregory of Tours had in his History plainly and fully written in the sixth Age.

This I answered in my last, by telling you that the Authour of this Sermon might either not know, or not regard Gregory of Tours; and urged the instance of St. Bernard, who notwithstanding Gregory's most full account of the Assumption, either doubted or disbelieved it; upon which I concluded that St. Bernard as well as the Authour of the 35th Sermon de Sanctis did either not know, or not regard Gregory of Tours. Against this plain and full answer you have made several objections: first you say, no one could be ignorant of what Gregory of Tours had written in the sixth Age; This is, Sir, affirming without proving; and though a contrary affirmation is sufficient against such a proof, yet I gave you there not onely the Instance of the Authour of this Sermon, which I can certainly prove to have been written much after Gregory's time, but the Instance of St. Bernard. I will add but one more to them, which I question not will satisfy all reasonable persons.

Isidore of Sevil lived in the beginning of the seventh Century, and is allowed by all to have lived at the beginning of it, and to have been not onely near Gregory of Tours's time, but near his Countrey, and therefore to have had the best opportunities of knowing this famous History, you so much insist on: and yet these are his words at the end of his account of the Life of the Virgin Mary; *no History informs us particularly that Mary suffered Martyrdom by the Sword, nor is her Death ANY WHERE READ of, nor her Burial* (o) *to be found any where.* As this Instance shews that Isidore was ignorant of Gregory of Tours's writing [and therefore no wonder that others were, who lived farther from his time,] so it holds as strong against the forged Melito and St. Hierom: and shews that Isidore was equally ignorant of them all, or looked upon them as so very fabulous and Apocryphal, that not one of them did deserve the name of an History.

And therefore as to the Equivocation that I make Fulbertus guilty of, when I make him say No-body writ of such a Subject positively, onely meaning that what was written was not true; I must tell you, Sir, that you wrong me very much in this passage; your onely meaning that

(o) Specialiter tamen nulla docet Historia Mariam gladii animadversione peremptam, quia nec obitus USPIAM legiunt, dum tamen nec reperiatur sepultura. Isidorus Hispal. de Vita & Morte SS. num. 68. p. 163. Edit. Paris 1580.

what was written was not true, is a very great misrepresentation of my words: I did insist there upon Fulbert's not knowing, as well as not regarding Gregory of Tours. I need only to put down my own expressions used in that Letter to let the world see how I am used by you. My words were these in relation to Gregory of Tours; It is no error to suppose the Author of that Sermon had never seen Gregory of Tours' book, and therefore might have that expression concerning no Latin Author treating of the Virgin Mary's Assumption: or we may very well suppose that if he had, he reckons his Story among those Apocryphal ones which were (p) THEN WRIT, but REJECTED by the Church of God. Whosoever will compare these expressions of mine and your charge, will easily see that there was no equivocation on my part but a great deal of misrepresenting on yours.

(p) Letter to
F. Sabran, p. 7.

Your next charge against me is as true; and you tell me that you never said (as I intimate) that St. Bernard disbelieved the blessed Virgin's Assumption. I cannot but wonder at such strange behaviour; whether you or I am the guilty person here, will quickly be seen by putting down both our words about this in the two Letters, which I will set one against the other, that all may see the Truth or falshood of this accusation.

F. Sabran's Expressions in the Letter to a Peer, p. 7. My Expressions in my Letter to F. Sabran, p. 7.

--- St. Bernard and others writ Sermons on our B. Lady's Assumption; although in those very Orations we find they DOUBTED OF, or DISBELIEVED her being assumed in Body into Heaven.

--- and not in St. Bernard, who so very long after either DOUBTED or DISBELIEVED the Story of the ASSUMPTION [in the vulgar corporal sense.]

It is time to return to the business of St. Isidore; you had said in your Letter to the Peer that there were several Isidores before St. Austin, and that the Isidore quoted here in the 35th Sermon must be one of them: to which I answered, that though there were never so many Isidores before St. Austin, yet can you, or dare you offer to shew that any of them were Writers? All the Answer you give in your Reply to this is, that it is childish. But is it, Sir, really so? the Isidore quoted was a Writer; I demanded of you to shew that any Isidore before St. Austin was a Writer: I do not wonder at your being disordered at

at this *Question*, though all the World cannot but see how very fair and reasonable: but the mischief is, neither St. *Hierom*, nor Bellarmine make mention of any such a *Writer* before St. *Austin*: and therefore it was the *wisest*, because the *best* answer that could be given to say mine was *childish*.

But that I might drive you from so weak a pretence, I told you that we are certain that the *Isidore* quoted in the *Sermon* is He that lived in the *Seventh Century*; and that if you did look into the *Louvain Edition*, when you wrote your *Letter* to the *Peer*, you could not have mis'd seeing what *Book* of his the *Passage* is taken from. Your *Reply* to this is very short, you say it was answered in your first *Letter*; what? answered before it was objected, I said not a syllable in my *Post-script*, nor you in your *Letter* to the *Lord* about what *Book* of St. *Isidore* this passage is taken from, or that the *Book* was mentioned in, and might be seen in the *Louvain Edition*; and yet you tell me that you have answered this in that *Letter*. But I easily see what it is that you mean by the *Answer*; it is, I suppose, that which you next insist on in the *Reply*, that the citation of *Isidore* could not be made out to be taken out of the *Book* cited by the *Louvain Divines*, the doubt there proposed being obvious, having been made (q) before St. *Austin's* time by St. (q) *Reply*, p. 7. *Epiphanius*. I would fain know, Sir, what we must gather hence, is it, that because the doubt was made by *Epiphanius* before St. *Austin's* time, therefore it was not made by *Isidore*, who lived so long after St. *Augustin's* time: or is it because the doubt was made then by *Epiphanius*, therefore it could not be made by *Isidore* afterwards. Either I see no *Logick*, or no *sense* here; and certainly, Sir, it is neither inconsistent, nor impossible, nor improbable that *Isidore* should in the *seventh Century* make such a doubt about the words of *Simeon*, as St. *Epiphanius* had made in the *fourth*. But all this illogical flustering is to no purpose, our debate is not about the doubt itself, or the *sense* or words of the passage, but whence the passage itself is taken; out of what *Author*, and out of what *Book* the words in the 35th *Sermon de Sanctis* are borrowed; and here, that I might put an end to the Excursions about things of no moment to the Controversie, and fix you, I did refer you to the *Book*, *Chapter* and *Page* in *Isidore* out of which the passage in the *Sermon* is taken. But to this I find not a syllable of answer made, nor the least notice taken of it; so that I should have suspected that your half hour had been out, which you were willing (r) to cast away upon answering (r) *Reply*, p. 1. me,

me, and therefore that you would say no more to me, did I not see that you had time still for a *whole Page* after *this*.

Whatever was the occasion of this Neglect, whether it was because you had not one word to reply to such a demonstrative Evidence, or for some other Reason, I will not trouble my self to guess; I intend not to be put off thus: and therefore I am resolved that you shall see the Passage in *Isidore*, and before it, what the *Benedictines* as well *Louvain Divines* have said about the 35th. *Sermon de Sanctis*, which is the Subject of the Debate betwixt us. The *Louvain Di-*

(1) Fuit, 35. de Sanctis, sed in plerisque Manuscriptis exemplaribus tribuitur Fulberto Carnotensi Episcopo citat autem Isidorem ex opere de Vita et obitu Sanctorum. Append. ad Tom. 10. Augustini p. 631. Edit. Colon. Agripp. 1616.

vines having thrown *this Sermon* into their *Appendix* as *spurious*, and having placed it the 83d. in their *Appendix* give this account of it. *This Sermon was the 35th. de Sanctis, but in (f) very many Manuscript Copies it is attributed to Fulbertus Carnotensis. It quotes Isidore out of his Work concerning the Life and Death of the Saints.*

The *Benedictines* of *Paris* in their *Edition* lately come over have also placed it in their *Appendix*, as none of *St. Austin's*, and their *Judgment* about it is thus delivered there: [This *Sermon* is the

(t) Incerti auctoris, qui multum Augustino recentiore Isidorum ex Opere de Vita & Obitu Sanctorum. In nostris Codicibus M. S. habetur absq; nomine auctoris. At in Lovaniensium plerisque; ut ipsi observant, Manuscriptis tribuitur Fulberto Episcopo Carnotensi Pref. Scilicet. 208. in Append. Tom. 5. p. 343. Edit. Benedic. Paris. 1683.

Work] of some uncertain *Author*, who quotes (t) *Isidore*, who is MUCH LATER than *St. Austin*, out of his *Work* concerning the *Life and Death of the Saints*. We have it in our *Manuscripts* without the name of any *Author*: but in very many of the MSS. of the *Louvain Divines*, as they themselves observe it is attributed to *Fulbertus Carnotensis*. Having now given you, Sir, the *Judgment* of the *Louvain Divines* as well as of the *Benedictines* in their own words. I will next produce the Passage as it is in *Isidore* himself, and as it is in the *Sermon*; that so you may see which *Isidore* it is about

whom so much noise hath been made:

The Words in the 35th. *Sermon de Sanctis*.

Hinc & Isidorus, Incertum est, inquit, per hoc dictum, utrum gladium Spiritus, an gladium dixerit persecutionis. Sermon. 208. in Append. Tom. 5. p. 344. Edit. Paris. 1683.

The Words of *Isidore* himself.

Quod quidem incertum est, utrum pro Martyrii gladio dixerit an pro Verbo Dei valido et acuto præ omni gladio ancipiti. Isidorus Hispal. de Vita & Morte Sanctorum c. 68. p. 168. Edit. Paris. 1580.

I can

I can see no place left now for Cavil, but this one, That the Words here put down are not exactly the same in the *Sermon*, and in the Book : But such a Cavil will neither be offered at, nor admitted by any Person of Learning, since every leatned Man knows that it is the frequent practice of those who cite other Mens Works, sometimes to keep exactly to the words of the Authour cited, sometimes to contract them, and sometimes to give onely the Sense of them : The *Authour* of this *Sermon* is an instance of this last Method, who tho' he hath contracted and partly changed the Words of *Isidore*, yet he hath given us the Sense of them ; which no body can deny to be that set down in the *Sermon*, *That it is uncertain whether by the Sword which Simeon said should pierce through the Virgin Mary's Soul, is meant the Sword of the Spirit, or the Sword of Persecution.*

I hope Sir, that after such invincible evidence against the *Sermon's* being St. *Austin's*, you will at last forsake your willfull mistake ; if such Arguments cannot perswade you, it must be because you are resolved not to be perswaded herein. I must, before I end this, take notice of your last Charge against me of imposing upon unthinking Readers when I represent that your Assertion was false, when you said that the Divines of Louvain did assert to St. *Austin* the 18th. *Sermon de Sanctis*. I do own my words there, and since you will force me, I do affirm it a second time that Your Assertion is false : and my farther Reason for it I will now give you here. The Divines of Louvain in their *Censura generalis* [which you may find on the back of their Title page to the Tenth Tome of St. *Austin's* Works] have distinguished all the *Sermons* of that Volume into three sorts : in the first sort they reckon those *Sermons* which did certainly appear to be St. *Austin's*, and them they put in the Volume with St. *Austin's* name before them. They next reckon those *Sermons* which are certainly not his, these *Sermons* they cast into the Appendix as spurious : their third sort are those which are doubtfull, which they leave in the Volume, but without St. *Austin's* name to them to distinguish them from the certain ones. With this information therefore we will look for the 18th. *Sermon*, we find it indeed in the Volume, but without St. *Austin's* name to it ; so that it is certain from this very Circumstance that the Louvain Divines looked upon it as dubious, and therefore did not prefix St. *Austin's* name to it, but put that note before it which I mentioned : I need add no more to so plain a proof ; as to your offering me *Natalis Alexandre's* Opinion, I have here proved that if he did

did assert the *same thing*, he was then as much mistaken as you. But pray, Sir, how come you to urge me with *N. Alexandre*? I had thought you had known that you are *excommunicate sine ulla alia declaratione*, if you either read or kept his Books.

You lastly put me in mind of the Business about *Invocation*, and your Challenge and Charge thereupon: I will be as good as my word, and will undertake that, as soon as this Controversie is either ended or dropt.

You are so angry at parting that I cannot but take notice of it; and therefore will be carefull to avoid a thing so indecent. If I have but given you hard Arguments for your hard Words, I have gained my Design. I am,

Reverend Sir,

Your Friend and Servant

in all Christian Offices.

Advertisement.

THE same day that F. Sabran's Reply to my last Letter was published, there came out a pretended Letter from a Dissenter to the Divines of the Church of England, &c. wherein I am accused of being a Papist. I am sufficiently certain that it came out of the same Printer's hands that F. Sabran's Reply did, and that it is from a Popish hand. I do here promise the World a speedy Vindication of my self from that Calumny, wherein I will shew that the Authour of that Letter is as good at Misrepresentations, as at stealing a Nubes Testium out of Natalis Alexandre.

FINIS.

